APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,492	06/18/2001	Michael Wayne Brown	AUS920010543US1	4149

			EXAMINER
7590	03/12/2004		NGUYEN, ANH T

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2127	

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-48* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-48 are presented for examination.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

Page 30, line 16, "Potions", should recite, --Portions--,

Page 14, line 17, "make", should recite, --may--,

Page 14, line 17, "know", should recite, --known--,

Page 15, line 11, "to exported", should recite, --to be exported--,

Page 15, line 11, "review", should recite, --reviewed--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for

failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as

the invention.

Claim 35 recites a method, which is improperly dependent on claim 25, which recites a

data processing system.

Clarification and/or correction are required.

For the purposes of applying prior art, Examiner interprets "The method of claim 25", as

recited in claim 35 as, --The data processing system of claim 25, which is consistent with the

language of claim 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on
sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8-30, and 32-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Maddalozzo, Jr. et al., ("Maddalozzo", US 6,012,093).

As per independent **claim 1**, Maddalozzo teaches a method in a data processing system

for managing a history for a browser, the method comprising: recording a history for a browser;

and selectively exporting a portion of the history for analysis (*Abstract*).

As per **claims 2 and 3**, which are dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the

portion covers a period of time for a session (col.4, lines 6-9)

As per **claim 4 and 5**, which are dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches presenting

the portion of the history wherein the portion includes a set of Web pages visited during the

period of time (*Abstract, Fig.5, step 511*).

As per **claim 6**, which is dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches displaying a graphical representation of the history; and receiving user input to select the portion of the history (Fig.5, col.5, lines 6-7).

As per **claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 6, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the graphical representation is in a form of a set of entries in a window (Fig.4, col.4, lines 39-40).

As per **claims 9 and 10**, which are dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo discloses wherein the recording step is initiated in response to a beginning of a browser session and the recording step terminates in response to a termination of the browsing session (col.3, lines 32-38, lines 66-67; col.4, lines 1-3)

As per **claim 11**, which is dependent on claim 1, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the recording step is initiated in response to a user input (col.4, lines 6-9).

As per **claim 12**, Maddalozzo teaches a method in a data processing system for logging browsing activities for a browser, the method comprising:

logging Web pages visited using the browser to form a log (col.4, lines 6-9);

presenting the log (col.4, lines 13-16);

receiving a selection of a portion of the log (col.4, line 14); and

storing the log in response to receiving the selection (col.4, lines 17-20).

As per **claim 13**, which is dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the log includes a plurality of browsing sessions (col.4, lines 42-44).

As per **claim 14**, which is dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the

selection is received from a user input (col.3, line 29, *respond to user inputs*).

As per **claim 15 and 16**, which is dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein

the log is stored in a storage device located within the remote data processing system (Fig.8,

col.3, lines 17-20).

As per **claims 17 and 18**, which are dependent on claim 12, Maddalozzo teaches wherein

the storing step forms a stored log and further comprising: presenting Web pages in the portion

of the log in response to an event of a user input (col.3, lines 17-30) .

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 12, and therefore is rejected under similar

rationale. Furthermore, Maddalozzo teaches sequentially displaying Web pages from the log

(Fig.4).

As per **claim 20**, which is dependent on claim 19, Maddalozzo teaches receiving a user

input manipulating presentation for the Web pages (col.3, lines 61-63).

As per **claim 21**, which is dependent on claim 20, Maddalozzo teaches wherein the user

input is one of a play, fast forward, reverse, or stop (Fig.3, col.3, lines 66-67, *commands 305*).

As per **claim 22**, Maddalozzo teaches a data processing system comprising:

a bus system (Fig.2, col.3, line1);

a communications unit connected to the bus system (Fig.2, col.3, lines 5-10);

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (Fig.2,col.3, line 4);

and a processing unit connected to the bus system (Fig.2, col.2, line 67; col.3,line1) wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to record a history for a browser; and selectively export a portion of the history for analysis (Fig.2,col.4, line 63) .

As per **claim 23,** Maddalozzo teaches a data processing system comprising:

a bus system (Fig.2, col.3, line1);

a communications unit connected to the bus system (Fig.2, col.3, lines 5-10);

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (Fig.2,col.3, line 4);

and a processing unit connected to the bus system (Fig.2, col.2, line 67; col.3,line1) wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to log Web pages visited using the browser to form a log (col.4, lines 6-9); presenting the log (col.4, lines 13-16); receiving a selection of a portion of the log (col.4, line 14); and storing the log in response to receiving the selection (col.4, lines 17-20).

As per **claim 24,** Maddalozzo teaches a data processing system comprising:

a bus system (Fig.2, col.3, line1);

a communications unit connected to the bus system (Fig.2, col.3, lines 5-10);

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of

instructions (Fig.2,col.3, line 4);

and a processing unit connected to the bus system (Fig.2, col.2, line 67; col.3,line1)

wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to log Web pages received by a

browser to form a log (col.4, lines 6-9); sequentially displaying Web pages from the log (Fig.4).

Claims 25-30 are similar in scope to claims 1-6, and therefore are rejected under

similar rationale.

Claims 32-35 are similar in scope to claims 8-11, and therefore are rejected under similar

rationale.

Claims 36-42 are similar in scope to claims 12-18, and therefore are rejected under

similar rationale.

Claims 43-45 are similar in scope to claims 19-21, and therefore are rejected under

similar rationale.

Claim 46 is similar in scope to claim 1, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 47 is similar in scope to claim 12, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 48 is similar in scope to claim 24, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
>
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
>
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
>
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
>
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Maddalozzo, Jr. et al., ("Maddalozzo", US 6,012,093) in view of Berstis (US 6,243,091).

As **per claims 7 and 31**, Maddalozzo teaches the invention substantially as claimed in

claims 6 and 30. However Maddalozzo does not specifically teach wherein the graphical

representation is in a form of a tree. Berstis teaches that websites can be organized as tree-like

structures (col.11, lines 12-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention include the tree structure taught by Berstis in the method as taught by

Maddalozzo because the tree data structure is adaptable to represent web pages associated with

the information for ease and simplicity of mapping objects within a website.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

      a) Maddalozzo, Jr. et al., US 6,012,093 teaches selectively displaying history files

         from previous network sessions.

      b) Berstis, US 6,243,091 teaches browser history in a global history window.

      c) Wynn et al., US 6,667,751 teaches a recording visual history browser.

      d) Sherrard et al., Us 6,608,634 teaches extracting selected portions of HTML

         documents associated with the selected website.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Anh T Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-8649. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

Anh T. Nguyen

Art Unit 2127

March 8, 2004

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100